DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 116 AL 001 980

By-Shuy, Roger W.

Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems. Prepublication Version.

Pub Date 20 Jun 69

Note-25p.; To be published in "Teaching Standard English to Inner-City Children," Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., Fall, 1969.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35

Descriptors-Applied Linguistics, Cultural Differences, *Disadvantaged Youth, Elementary School Teachers, Inservice Teacher Education, *Language Arts, *Nonstandard Dialects, Preservice Education, Sociolinguistics, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Improvement, Tenl, Urban Education, Urban Language

A recent study of 30 urban teachers showed that they were not only unable to give a precise description of their students' speech, but had no idea of how to go about making a description. Their ideas on vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation were formed by popular folk-lore rather than linguistic knowledge. Current teacher training programs are inadequate and weak in this area. To begin with, the preparation of language arts teachers must be overhauled to put language at the center of the program. Teachers need to know how to deal with the child's language, how to listen and respond to it, how to diagnose what is needed, how to best teach alternate linguistic systems, and how to treat it as a positive and healthy entity. This ability can best be achieved through such pre-service college courses as: (1) "The Nature of Language," (language attitudes, stereotypes, phonetics, grammar, the systematic nature of language); (2) "Language Variation," (geographic and social dialects); (3) "Fieldwork in Child Language," (experience in recording and analyzing language data from at least one child-subject); and (4) "Teaching Standard English to the Disadvantaged Child," (definition of the problem and implementation of solutions). Currently employed teachers would take the same courses in two-summer, full-time institutes to allow sufficient maturation time for new ideas. (JD)

ED030119

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Roger W. Shuy
Center for Applied Linguistics
June 20, 1969

Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems
Prepublication Version

Back in the days when the universe was orderly, when subject matter was a fixed commodity and methology was a science, we knew exactly how to train teachers to meet the daily needs of their students. In that by-gone time there was a rather clear separation of the disciplines and, although we talked a great deal about suiting the teaching strategy to the individual needs of each student, nobody really paid any attention to this dictum and it can be strongly suspected that nobody really believed it anyway. We gave prospective teachers a strong dose of educational history, theory and method along with the appropriate courses in "special methods of." There was a good bit of talk about slow learners but they were quickly siphoned off to vocational education tracks and those who were discipline problems were encouraged, in one way or another to "seek employment as soon as possible to insure economic adjustment."

But now the time have caught up with us. We have painted ourselves into the corner of compulsory attendance in the schools. We have developed a generation of people who are rightfully demanding relevance and who are adept at spotting a phoney from a hundred yards away. All these years of talking about "meeting the child where he is" have come back to us with interest, for it has become clear that language research is finally catching up with educational precept and, quite simply, it is time to practice what we preach. In this essay I will attempt to point

AL 001 980

out a path toward preparing teachers to do this practicing. Like all assignments of this sort, it is wise to first assess the current situation, then prescribe a remedy.

What Do Teachers Know About Language

Relatively little research has been done on what the teacher knows, feels or thinks about the language of disadvantaged pupils. Considerable data have been gathered on how a teacher is trained, on whether or not he feels adequately trained, and on what he actually does in the process of teaching. But sophisticated assessments of what teachers really know about the language used by children and how they feel about it are scarce. We know from The National Interest and the Teaching of English that the linguistic preparation of prospective English teachers is woefully inadequate.[1] It should not be surprising, then, that teachers find it difficult to describe accurately the language problems of their disadvantaged students. As an adjunct to our recent research on Detroit speech, Anne E. Hughes randomly selected thirty urban teachers and asked them to identify the language problems of their students who were designated, in one way or another, as disadvantaged.[2]

Vocabulary

Eighty percent of the teachers observed that their students have a limited vocabulary and many teachers offered a reason for this handicap:

> "In the program, the children come with a very meager vocabulary, I would say. I think it's because of the background of the home and the lack of books at home, the lack of communication with the family, especially, if there are only one or two children in the family. Perhaps if there are more children in the family communication might be a bit better. They might have a few more words in their vocabulary".

> "In the inner-city, the child's vocabulary is very limited. His experiences are very limited.

These comments are typical for they blame the limited vocabulary on the home situation. Neither teacher gave any indication that the home environment might produce a different vocabulary. On the contrary, both felt that lack of school vocabulary was equivalent to a lack of overall vocabulary.

This widely held but erroneous concept (that "disadvantaged" children have limited vocabularies) appears to stem from fairly recent research reports on the language of the disadvantaged child. Nothing in the current research of sociolinguists supports this idea. The notion that children in disadvantaged homes have limited vocabularies may mean that the investigators proved to be such a cultural barrier to the interviewee that the informants were too frightened and awed to talk freely, that the investigators simply asked the wrong questions or that their life-styles simply require different lexicons.

The interviewed teachers' misconceptions about the size of a disadvantaged child's vocabulary may be illustrated as follows:

> "Some had a vocabulary of about a hundred and some words, I'd say; no more than that. They got along fine with what they knew. They didn't have any trouble expressing themselves. They knew the important words for them to get along okay. Some could talk your foot off. I mean, they just knew everything. The quieter ones were the ones who didn't have a large vocabulary.

The absurdity of assuming that a child has only a hundred words or so is one of the curious stereotypes of the teaching profession. What is more distressing than this hyperbole, however, is the condescending tone (they got along fine with what they knew) and the assumption that quiet children are quiet because they have no vocabulary.

Grammar

The responses of these teachers to the grammar problems of their disadvantaged students is equally naive. One third of the teachers characterized the child's greatest problem as his failure to speak in sentences and/or complete thoughts:

> "I can't get them to make a sentence. Even if I have them repeat after me exactly, they don't do it. They repeat in sentences they are familiar with. They're not really sentences but fragments of sentences that are familiar to them, and they understand them. They don't realize that they aren't making a complete thought".

> "Where we would use a sentence to convey a thought, they are in the habit of maybe using a phrase or just a few words to try to convey the same thought which I would presume would affect their communication to a great extent".

Although 30% of the teachers described their students' grammar as poor and/or limited, one might seriously question some teachers' understanding of what grammar means:

> "The biggest problem that I've had so far is 'I'm gonna'".

> "Because there is no real honest communication between parent and child, the child isn't taught to listen. He doesn't hear; he doesn't enunciate, you see".

> "These children cut words off: 'could' would be 'ould', such as in "Ould you like to do this?' Too, their 'l's' were often missing."

Even when their responses reflected a clearer distinction between phonology and grammar, the description was often not accurate enough to be diagnostically useful.

> "Their grammar problems are many because they use substitutions, this for that."

> "They use a personal pronoun after a name".

As for current pedagogical technique, there is little to choose from if the teachers' responses are considered as a guide:

"I introduce the verb to children as an action word showing them what they're doing and the noun as the name of the person or place. That helps them write and speak in a complete sentence".

"When I say, 'Where can I get a pencil?', they will answer, 'Here it goes'. It is hard for them to say 'Here it is', but if I talk enough about it, they may change".

Pronunciation

The teachers generally had more to say about pronunciation than vocabulary or grammar. Again there were over generalizations such as:

"I have one child who mispronounces almost every word, but they say he does not have a speech problem".

"Many times they mispronounce because they do not know the sounds".

"They do have trouble with pronunciation for they fail to use their teeth and tongue and their lips. This is necessary for getting the correct sound".

Their trouble was the use of dialect for they said hal for how. It was southern dialect among some of the children which caused them to use the wrong words".

"Pronunciation is poor. Things like,'I wanna go', or 'punkin' for 'pumpkin' and things like that. Their dialect is just hard to understand for most teachers. We were born and raised in the Midwest, for the most part".

It is indeed difficult to imagine a speaker of understandable English who fails to use his teeth and tongue and lips. The supposed substitution of hal for how indicates an awareness of the l problem in non-standard English but a confusion of how it works (the l is not inserted, it is deleted). The parochialism of the last quotation is unsound for it is an easy matter to cite pronunciations of wanna for want to in the speech of any prestigous American.

As for specific kinds of pronunciation problems, the teachers agreed rather clearly that disadvantaged children delete word final consonant sounds:

> "They leave off last sounds, leave off beginning sounds some times. But then I have that trouble now even with the other children. I keep saying to them to put in all the letters for that's why they're there".
>
> "Some of the children had problems with their consonants, particularly at the ends of words".
>
> "They leave off the endings of words; instead of 'going' it's 'goin'. (Also the d's and t's give them trouble.) Even at the beginning of words you often cannot hear the beginning letter".
>
> "I think that they're in the habit of not saying the things as clearly as we do and they say a word such as 'looking' by leaving the g off".

The teachers' confusion of sounds and orthography is perhaps to be expected (for it seems widespread in the country) but it may be confusing to a first grade child to be told to add a g when the ng combination stands for a single sound.

On the other hand, these teachers came a bit closer to some of the significant problems of disadvantaged pronunciation than they did for vocabulary or grammar. 17% cited the /ŋ → n/substitution, for example. In general, however, the analyses were too vague to be diagnostically useful. A major point to be learned here is that there is a pattern in inner-city speech--just as there is pattern in most every kind of speech. Secondly, the teacher neither described the problem accurately nor understood its pattern.

One of the most important aspects of problems of language development among disadvantaged children, therefore, centers on imprecise descriptions of the problem, large scale ignorance of how to make such a description and extant folk-lore which passes as knowledge about a vastly neglected and underprivileged group of human beings. Having said this, it is no difficult matter to say that the current linguistic sophistication of teachers is rather limited.

What Do Teachers Need To Know About Language?

Extant attempts to prepare teachers adequately for the classroom of the disadvantaged student are disappointingly weak. Few undergraduate courses are offered in subjects even remotely related to the linguistic aspects of the problem. Even occasional college courses such as The Nature of Language, Introductory Linguistics, Modern Grammar, American English, etc. are seldom offered and, if offered, seldom required of teachers and, if required of teachers, seldom geared to minority language problems. Thus the anomaly exists. Although one of the most urgent situations in our schools focuses on the language problems of blacks and other minority groups, there is virtually no preparation for such problems in the college curricula.[3]

Part of the reason why such courses have been slow to develop is found in the suddenness and recentness of our discovery of the problem. Although English teachers have long wrestled with the problem of making acceptable speakers of English out of non-standard speakers, it is only with the recent emphasis on urban problems, black awareness and a new kind of social responsibility that we have given serious consideration to the specific problems of minority groups, the black, urban poor in particular. Then, as is often the case in education, the need for teaching materials preceded any strongly felt need for theoretical bases or empirical research upon which such materials could be based. As absurd as it may seem to produce classroom materials before establishing a theoretical base for their development, that is exactly what has happened in this field today. To complicate matters even more, some sensitive teachers, realizing that their training has not been adequate for their needs, are now asking for that training, preferably in condensed and intensive packages. As healthy as this situation may appear to be, it has only triggered still another problem--that of finding adequately trained professionals who can provide this training.

Ideally what is needed at the moment is more training of professional basic researchers in the field, more application of this basic research to pedagogy and more programs for training teacher-intermediaries to use these materials and techniques in the classrooms. Although the focus of this paper is on the latter, it is difficult to separate the training of teachers from basic research, for good teacher training cannot be separated from an understanding of the motives and results of the basic researchers.

Without apology, then, let me suggest that teachers need to know about the current research in urban language problems. It would be helpful if they knew why the research is being done, something about how it is carried out, what is known at the moment and, everybit as important, what is not known. Further, teachers need to assess their own language in relation to that of their pupils. They need to understand language variation -- the reasons underlying it and the attitudes of various sub-groups toward it. Teachers should be trained to listen to the language of their students. They should learn how systematic various dialects can be and they should develop a sensitivity to the editing processes that take place as one person listens to another. The teacher should learn enough about foreign language methodology to be able to handle material of the sort discussed by Irwin Feigenbaum (pp to) and they should learn enough about sociolinguistics to be able to understand and make use of suggestions of the sort made by Ralph Fasold and Walter Wolfram (pp to).

It should be clear from the outset, however, that the suggestions which follow are not intended to constitute a mere appendage to the already existing teacher training program. Elsewhere I have expressed

the strong feeling that the traditional language arts teacher preparation program gives far too much attention to matters of administration, teaching techniques and methods of evaluation at the expense of the study of language, the real content of their teaching. A recent national conference on educating the disadvantaged devoted less than 5% of its attention during the two days of meetings on the content of such education. Practically all of the papers and discussion centered on funding such programs, administrating them and evaluating them. These are, of course, important matters, but one must eventually ask what we are funding, administrating and evaluating. If we are to merely add another course to extant teacher preparation, we may as well turn our attention to other things. For the field of the language arts needs more than another tag-on; it needs a total overhaul.

Although it seems ludicrous to have to say so, the preparation of language arts teachers must be over-hauled to put language at the center of the program, accompanied wherever possible by courses in administration, techniques and evaluation. By far the most important tool for survival, for communicating and for obtaining knowledge and skills is language. For children, this is an indisputable fact. It is as true for middle class children as for disadvantaged socio-economic groups. But if the circumstances under which poor children acquire this tool militate in some way against their acquiring middle class language patterns, some kind of special attention must be given them. This special attention requires of the teacher:

1. An ability to recognize and react adequately to contrastive language patterns
2. An ability to do something about them when appropriate
3. An ability to keep from doing something about them when appropriate.

Earlier we observed that there is no evidence to date which indicates that we are training teachers adequately to handle #1. There is relatively little in the way of materials geared to accommodate #2. There is practically no understanding of #3 among teachers or, for that matter, among textbook writers.

In short, what teachers need to know in order to fulfill their educational obligations to the ghetto child (or, in fact, to any child) is how to deal with the child's language, how to listen and respond to it, how to diagnose what is needed, how to best teach alternate linguistic systems and how to treat it as a positive and healthy entity. What follows will include a brief and speculative effort to formalize these requirements in terms of the traditional course structure of our educational system.

How Should They Be Taught?

Experience during the past two or theee years has taught us that there is no magic package which is guaranteed to produce adequately trained teachers in short periods of time. A summer workshop or institute may be helpful if it is specific to a well defined aspect of the necessary training but it is doubtful that such a program can come close to covering the required material or that it will provide maturation time to accomodate the new thought-set which is demanded. Several pre-service college courses may contribute significantly to the proper linguistic perspective. At the expense of being overly traditional, let us first propose what these college courses might contain, then consider ways of covering this material in in-service training programs.

Suggested College Courses

It will be quite useful for later discussion of language variation and change, foreign language learning techniques, grammatical and phonological features, etc. if the basic linguistic tools are covered in an introductory course. As they are now constituted, most "Introduction to Linguistics" courses do not meet this need. They tend to focus entirely on either generative grammar with examples from English or a kind of history of linguistic theory culminating in modern thought. Occasionally such a course follows the older segmentation into phonetics, phonemics, morphology and syntax, using textbooks such as H. A. Gleason's Introduction to Description Linguistics (Holt, 1958).

Other extant introductory courses may also be called into question. College English departments often offer courses in "The History of the English Language" and in "Modern English Grammar." Although the concept of language change is of great importance for teachers, the usual approach in such a course will provide them with a great deal more than they need to know. The particulars of Grimm's Law and the pronoun system of Old English are in some ways interesting, but of no immediate relevance to the teacher of disadvantaged children. The study of the grammar of modern English is considerably closer to the needs of the teacher but it covers only part of the large territory which needs to be covered. Usually very little is done, for example, with the specific features of non-standard English heard everyday at their schools or about language variation of any sort. There is usually no accompanying experience with actual language data and no relationship with the specific educational concerns of teachers.

If there is time in the training program, a course in "Modern English Grammar" would be quite appropriate for elementary as well as

secondary teachers. My own experience with this course is that a very small number of students were elementary majors. Their curriculum was already too crowded with other things and it is almost never a required course for future elementary teachers.

If such a course is taken, it should be accompanied by others which stress language variation, language change, problems of discovering and maintaining standard English, a contrastive analysis of certain standard and non-standard grammatical and phonological features, actual fieldword in the language of children, an examination of approaches to teaching second dialect, and the relationship of dialect to reading. Perhaps earlier, however -- even at the very beginning of their training, future teachers should be confronted with some of the attitudinal problems and establishment mythology about language. It is at this stage in their education that it is good to divest teachers of the false assumptions about language which continue to characterize the profession.

In order to insure some sort of orderly acquisition of linguistic knowledge, accompanied by desired attitudes toward language, let me suggest the following college courses which should form the core of the future teacher's training in the language arts or English.

1. <u>The Nature of Language.</u> In this course, special attention will be placed on language attitudes. Various tests will be administered at the beginning of the course as a measure of entry attitudes and knowledge and as a point for later discussion. These tests could be at several levels of abstraction. One, for example, might have only written simuli of the following sort:

a. <u>Language Stereotype Index</u>

T F 1. Language change will ultimately cause degredation in the language.

T F 2. A speaker should avoid using dialect at all times.

T F 3. There is no evidence to support the claim that there is a relationship between climatic heat and slowness of speech.

T F 4. Poor black children speak a version of English which has system and regularity.

T F 5. To improve one's social acceptability to a middle class society, working class people should focus primarily on vocabulary development.

One difficulty with abstract test questions such as the one illustrated above is that it is difficult to determine exactly how much of the teacher's attitude is attributable to actual language attitude and how much stems from a kind of stereotyped inheritance. That is, is the teacher's attitude a real one or one that he feels should be given under these circumstances. A teacher, for example, may not personally care about or believe in teaching children on an individual basis but when asked about useful techniques of teaching she may well utter the term, "individualized instruction." It is because ot this tendency that I refer to the above type of test as a language stereotype index.

Another type of attitude measurement is considerably less abstract. The stimulus, in this case, is a tape reocrding of people talking. Center for Applied Linguistics researchers have used one of the audio-tapes originally prepared for the Psycholinguistic Attitude Study as an introduction to discussions about social dialect variation. Following is a typescript of one segment of this tape:

b. Tape Stimulus Index

I just look at it some time and then somtime I be busy. I just half look at it. I never hardly look at one all the way through. I never found one that was too much of a favorite. We used to go (to) the theater alot you know. Well it all blends in the same thing like that. And a guy just look at it so often well you don't care too much about it.

The listener is asked to respond to this tape recording by answering the following (or other similar) questions:

1. What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White ( )
2. What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?
   ( ) a. College graduate usually with graduate training. Dentist,mechanical engineer, personnel manager.
   ( ) b. High school graduate, probably some college or technical school. Printer, post office clerk, small business owner or manager.
   ( ) c. Some high school, or high school graduate. Bus driver, carpenter, telephone lineman.
   ( ) d. Not beyond 8th grade. Dishwasher, night watchman, construction laborer.
3. Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

correct ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: incorrect

awkward ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: graceful

relaxed ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____:tense

formal ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: informal

clear ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: thick

As it turns out, this particular subject is Negro and fits category 2c. Answer to Question 3, which is more evaluative, will probably relate to the answers previously given to 1 and 2. An interesting variation of this procedure would be to ask only one question at a time, playing the same tape three times (mixed between other passages). This procedure might help reduce the potential influence of one answer or another. But, of course, the test is not to determine how accurate the listeners can be as much as to serve as a take-off point for a following discussion. Why did the listener think the speaker was Negro? What clues led him to suspect that he was 2c? Why does he consider him relaxed? The very doing of this exercise clearly illustrates the future teachers' need to be able to develop a vocabulary for talking about language differences with accuracy and precision. It can alert the teachers to their critical need to hear phonological differences which have social consequences. It forces them to abandon their reliance on stereotypes about language and to listen on their own. Listening to the same tape at a later time will also show them something about how we severely edit what we listen to and, ultimately, hear what we want to hear.

Still another type of language attitude test focuses not on stereotyped ideas about language or tape recorded stimuli but on language concepts. Again the Psycholinguistic Attitude Study provides a clue to the sort of question which might be asked. In this study, the following language concepts were presented: Detroit Speech, White Southern Speech, British Speech, Negro Speech and Standard Speech. These were presented, on paper, in the following manner:

1. DETROIT SPEECH

slow	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	fast
simple	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	complex
valuable	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	worthless
bad	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	good
thick	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	clear
sloppy	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	careful
smooth	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	rough
negative	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	positive
easy	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	difficult
sharp	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	dull
dumb	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	smart
strong	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	weak

Many other situations might be studied including, School Speech, Playground Talk, Political Addresses, etc. Likewise, other polar adjectives might be used, particularly those which have evaluative functions.

Some language attitude studies, then, would provide a starting point for the introductory course in the nature of language. From these, stress should be placed on phonetics (in order to learn how to recognize and produce phonetic differences) and on the study of grammar (with a number of problems to be solved). The systematic nature of language should be emphasized throughout.

2. Language Variation. Once certain tools for discussing language have been established, it is possible to approach language variation more adequately. Since geographical variation is generally recognized by most people, it seems reasonable to use regional dialects as a beginning point. There are several books and discs available for illustrative purposes. Emphasis should be placed on the systematic nature of geographical differences, whether grammatical, phonological or lexical. A certain amount of practice in gathering data of all three categories is desirable both for practice in the tool subjects mastered in The Nature of Language and in getting used to discovering language patterns synchronically.

Once geographical variation is fairly well studied, the major portion of the course should focus on social dialects. Attention should be given to problems of the relationship of attitudes to labeling (Black English, ghetto speech, disadvantaged language, etc.) but the major focus should reflect the recent work of sociolinguists. The course should contain units on the historical origins of current non-standard, grammatical and phonological features (including correlations with social stratification), frequency of occurrence and social diagnosticity. Early attention should be given the concepts of linguistic variation, the linguistic continuum and matters of style shifting. The concept of language interference must be emphasized particularly in relation to interference caused by the system of various non-standards on the system of standard. This concept may be most easily presented by observing the influence of the Spanish system on the production of English by people of Spanish speaking ancestry. Since many of these people constitute a large portion of the disadvantaged in our country anyway, the example is doubly useful. Once the notion of linguistic interference is introduced across different language systems, it may be easier to teach the notion of linguistic interference across two dialects.

3. Fieldwork in Child Language. This course should be primarily an experience in gathering language data and analysis of certain linguistic features.

Near the beginning of the course students carefully review the details of field techniques, especially matters relating to selection of subjects, recording techniques, and methods of elicitation (see Dan Slobin, ed., A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence, Berkeley, 1967 and R. Shuy, W. Wolfram and W. Riley, Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study, Washington: CAL, 1968). Special attention should be given to different techniques of language data elicitation such as sentence imitation, word games, narratives, citation forms, oral reading, dialog and communicative routines for the linguistic responses may well relate to the elicitation mode.

It is difficult to determine exactly how such a course should be conducted but one thing is of utmost importance: the students should get deeply involved in recording and analyzing the language of at least one child-subject. One technique which I have found useful toward this end is to require each student to get at least an hour of tape recorded, interview style data from one disadvantaged child in a nearby community. It makes little difference what the child talks about as long as there is a great deal of his speech and as little of that of the interviewer as possible. Subjects for discussion will vary somewhat but most people can describe television programs or movies and almost everyone can tell you how to play a game of some sort. The value of such an exercise may be observed from a report of one of my students in a recent experienced teacher class called Problems in Urban Language:

> This inverview was perhaps my greatest, most enlightening learning experience of the entire year. I talked to Reynaldo for 40 minutes and he thought I was the dumbest white woman he had ever seen. I was trying to remember all that I had been told about interviewing and drawing out an informant. As you will see, I had to act ignorant

about basketball, football, and even the name of our nation's capital! You will be interested to know that during the interview I didn't hear any errors in his speech. I was terribly disappointed. Later, as I listened to it for the third time I thought I detected a few; but it wasn't until I wrote down every single word that I realized the many interesting features in his speech. As you will see, the results were amazing.

This teacher's remarks about the outwardly simple task of listening analytically to the speech of a child are typical of most teachers who have been forced to do this sort of thing. At first, they can't imagine why they were subjected to this assignment. They are even more dismayed when they are required to typescript the entire tape recording, using standard orthography (no attempt at reflecting pronunciation).[5] This process is time consuming and laborious but it serves several important purposes:

1. It forces the listener to listen carefully to the tape recording. During the early analysis stages of the Detroit Dialect Study in 1966, several Detroit teachers were temporarily employed doing this sort of typescripting. After three of four days of solid listening one of them remarked to me that although she had been teaching in a Head Start school for several years, she had never really <u>listened</u> to these children before. Just the task of listening and typescripting, then, served a useful function.

2. It provides a reference point for further listening and for future grammatical and phonological analysis. Anyone who has worked with long tape-recordings knows the amount of time it takes just to find the place he is looking for. If there is a typescript to accompany the tape, one can mark in advance the potential spots where the phonological feature under consideration is likely to occur. In the case of grammatical features, the typescript may itself be adequate for analytical procedures.

When the field interview and typescripting are completed, students should be required to select one or more interesting grammatical and phonological features for thorough analysis, including a search of the available literature and a description which calls upon and uses what they have learned about language analysis to this time.

4. Teaching Standard English to the Disadvantaged Child. As in the preceding courses, this course should be problem oriented. Two problems of great magnitude might occupy the attention of the class near the beginning of the course. Considerable ink has been spilled in an as yet unsuccessful attempt to define the disadvantaged. However trite this may seem to do, it is important that students realize the quandry we are in whenever we start to discuss the topic. The second problem may come as a surprize to the students. Standard English is equally difficult to define. An early project, then, might be to require all students to try to define standard English in a page or less of text. Chances are that they will find their own papers unsatisfactory. Some will refer to dictionaries, some will argue from sociological or political grounds, some will opt for the mass media as the norm and some will say that it is what is taught in the schools. Any answer should bring forth a challenge from other students in the class.

There is a small but interesting literature on the nature of Standard language which has been written in recent years by linguists (see, for examply, Punya Sloka Ray, "Language Standardization" in Frank A. Rice ed., Study of the Role of Second Languages Washington; CAL, 1962, William Labov "Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English" in Roger Shuy ed., Social Dialects and Language Learning, Champaign: NCTE, 1965, and Otto Jespenson, Mankind, Nation and Individual, Bloomington: Indiana U. Press, 1946).

After this introduction, the bulk of the course will be taken up by the study of biloquialism. The issues discussed in this publication are of great concern for this audience. Students should be introduced to foreign language teaching techniques (see, for example, Robert Lado 1967) and there should be discussion of how these techniques apply to learning standard English.

Students should then be guided in an examination of extant oral language materials for non-standard speakers (Lin 1964, Golden 1965, Hurst 1965, Feigenbaum 1969) and they should review the literature on the relationship of second dialect acquisition in the appropriate journals.

A worthwhile project in such a course would be the construction of teaching materials which deal with features the students analyzed in their earlier fieldwork experiences. It should be clear, however, that the students are not expected to produce materials which are equivalent to that of professional materials developers any more than they are expected to produce professional sonnets in a Shakespeare course. The aim of producing materials is primarily to understand something about how they are constructed -- and why.

A second large area of application of social dialect information is that of dialect interference to reading. To this point, relatively little has been written on the subject and much of it is conveniently located in J. Baratz and R. Shuy, eds. Teaching Black Children to Read, Washington, CAL, 1969. Teachers should be encouraged to consider problems of dialect interference through phonology, grammar and orthography and they should examine current beginning reading materials to determine how well they adjust to the linguistic features discussed in earlier courses.

With the introduction of these four courses into the pre-service training program we will be considerably closer to training teachers adequately to meet the language problem of poor, minority group children. It is important, however, that these courses be considered central and not optional or peripheral. The subject matter and skills involved in well taught courses of this sort is, without doubt, among the most important training our future teachers will receive. And this is only, at best, minimal. If students can take additional courses from the available offerings in linguistics it will certainly be to their advantage.

Our first aim is to put the training system in perspective so that teachers who teach language arts courses will be trained in language. But it is foolish to think that we can ignore in-service training entirely. Just as education can not afford to choose between compensatory education and educational overhaul, so teacher training can not really make a choice between pre-service and in-service programs.

Suggested In-Service Programs

Obviously, the most useful way to provide the insights and skills necessary for the intelligent handling of language problems of the ghetto child is for currently employed teachers to study the same subjects that the future teachers are given. The usual comprimise is to build some kind of summer workshop or institute which condenses and selects from among the contents ingredients of these courses and pretends that the same ground has been covered. Another package would be to present all four courses during an eight or ten week summer session. Although either of the above approaches is better than most current situations, neither allows for that important ingredient, maturation time. Just as it is absolutely necessary that the four courses described earlier be taken one at a time, so it is imperative that in-service training allow for the acquisition and digestion of each segment before the next one is attempted. At least, I would suggest no less than a two-summer full-time institute. During the first summer, teachers could study both the Nature of Language and Language Variation. During the second summer they could take Field-work in Child Language and Teaching Standard English. But better would be a year long part-time program in which the courses are taken one at a time. Better still would be a year of released time for teachers to take a battery of courses in linguistics and TESOL. If such were possible, it would be wise to expand their course work in the Nature of Language in order to increase linguistic knowledge and skills. If possible it would also be useful to prepare these teachers as specialists in English as a second language, especially for Spanish speakers.

Who Should Do The Teaching?

In recent years it has been suggested that black teachers can best teach black children. No one will argue concerning the potential advantage to having a native "feel" or understanding for the problems of the people with whom we deal. A similar situation exists in the basic research which feeds into the development of classroom materials and strategies. It is no secret that few black linguists have chosen this field to work in and that the major researchers in this field are, currently, white. To some people, this situation automatically disqualifies the research. Even if it were true that none of the research done by white scholars is useful or accurate, it is impossible to argue that black researchers would have done better when, indeed,

only a small percentage of the output in the field has come from black linguists. A much more reasonable position to take would be to assert that black research linguists may well have certain insights that some white linguists have not yet displayed. No one can aruge with this as a possibility. But this does not necessarily impugn the research on black speech done thus far by white linguists. If such research is to be denegrated, it remains to be proven how.

This native "feel" or understanding of the ghetto which black linguists may hold to advantage over white linguists may parallel a kind of "feel" for black children which black teachers may have. Again, no one can deny the possibility. To be sure white educators have certainly not distinguished themselves in educating black children. On the other hand, neither have black educators. If it is true that only black teachers can really educate black children it has certainly not yet been proven.

A good case could be made, however, that being black does not remove all problems from either the researcher or the educator. It has been observed many times that the language problems of black children can be grim reminders of all that held black teachers back for so long. It is quite apparent, in fact, that some black teachers can build an utter intolerance of the black children in their classes largely as a result of their language behavior. Although such teachers are deeply in favor of helping children acquire middle class linguistic habits, criticisms of the child's failures are so severe that whatever is gained by being black is cancelled out by the same phenomenon.

We are not saying, however, that black children should be taught by white teachers. We are observing, instead, that race is probably not the most crucial factor in determing who should do the teaching. More crucial is the ability of the teacher to understand the systematicity of non-standard speech and accept it as a logical and useful entity for certain but not all language situations, and the relative racism of the attitude of white or black teachers as well as their linguistic sophistication. In other words, the decision of who should do the teaching must be based on criteria of intelligence, personality and emotional stability -- the very factors upon which most personnel decisions are made anyway.

Once the problem of the race of the teacher is resolved, the larger question is, what agents should carry out the overhaul required in teacher training if we are to accomplish the ends set out in the preceding pages? As a linguist, I would like to think that linguistics departments would be concerned enough to cooperate with teacher training programs, even at the expense of dirtying their hands with mere applied linguistics. Like it or not, linguists have the training which is closest to the needs of the moment and it seems reasonable that an adequate supply of linguists could be found to handle these courses at selected major teacher training institutions. The training of linguists has reached a stage at which it will become increasingly difficult to find enough teaching jobs in linguistics departments to handle the number of recent graduates. Thus, the necessary training in sociolinguistics which has been outlined here can provide not only an answer to teacher education but also to the impending glut on the job market in linguistics. The danger, if linguists handle the courses noted above, is that they will want to wander off into their specialties and create another educational elite.

The field of linguistics has been relatively late in coming to grips with contemporary social issues. Much of such concerns of linguists in the sixties has been with issues not directly related to their discipline. Many linguists have spoken out on the Viet Nam war, on racism, on various political issues, but within the discipline there has been little which has directly linked linguistics with modern social and political issues. The matter of teacher training as outlined in this paper is the closest such opportunity the discipline may ever have. It would be tragic for linguists to pass it by.

FOOTNOTES

1. The National Interest and the Teaching of English, Champaign: NCTE, 1961, pp 74-75.

2. This research is reported fully in anne E. Hughes, "An Investigation of Some Sociolinguistic Phenomena in the Vocabulary, Pronunciation and Grammar of Detroit Pre-School Children, their Parents and Teachers," Unpublished Ed.D. Dessertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

3. This is not to say that such courses do not exist. At the time of this writing, several rather comprehensive courses of this type are being taught at various American universities including UCLA, Columbia Teachers College, Georgetown University, Trinity College (D.C.), and Northeastern Illinois.

4. See Shuy, "Language Variation and Literacy," in a forthcoming IRA publication.

5. For an example of a typescript of this sort, see R. Shuy, W. Wolfram and W. Riley, Field Techniques In An Urban Language Study, Washington: CAL, 1968, pp. 67-114.

Baratz, Joan and R. W. Shuy (eds.) Teaching Black Children To Read. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Feigenbaum, Irwin. English Now. New York: New Century, 1969.

Gleason, H. A. Introduction to Descriptive Linguistis. New York: Holt, 1958.

Golden, Ruth. "Instructional Record for Changing Regional Speech Patterns" Folkway/Scholastic, No. 9323.

Hughes,Anne E. "An Investigation of Some Sociolinguistic Phenomena in the Vocabulary, Pronunciation and Grammar of Detroit Pre-school Children, their Parents and Teachers," unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Hurst, Charles. Psychological Correlates In Dialectolalia.. Washington, D.C., Howard University, 1965.

Jesperson, Otto. Mankind, Nation and Individual. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1946.

Labov, William. "Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English," in R. Shuy (ed.) Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill., NCTE, 1965.

Lado, Robert. Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Lin, Samisers. Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect. New York: Columbia University, 1965.

The National Interest and the Teaching of English. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1961.

Ray, Punya Sloka. "Language Standardization" in Frank A.Rice (ed.) Study of the Role of Second Languages. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1962.

Shuy, Roger W. "Language Variation and Literacy," (forthcoming) IRA.

Shuy, Roger W., Walter A. Wolfram and William K. Riley. Field Techniques In An Urban Language Study, Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968

Slobin, Dan (ed.) A Field Manual for Cross Cultural Study of The Acquisition of Communicative Competence. Berkeley: U. of California, 1967.